

**Appln No. 10/501,201**  
**Amdt date March 29, 2007**  
**Reply to Office action of December 29, 2007**

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-29 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1 and 14 are independent. Claims 1-10 and 14-16 have been amended herein. No new matter has been added. None of the claims has been cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-29.

**I. Rejection of Claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph**

Claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner contends that the "claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In particular, the Examiner contends that in claims 1 and 4-10, "recitation of 'energy recovery unit' are found not fully described in the specification so as this feature can be identified through drawings by its designated numerical reference while the term of 'a first energy recovery unit' and 'a second energy recovery unit' appeared in claim 14 mean to include different elements in while lacking of detail supported from the specification." The remaining claims were rejected due to their virtual dependency on the allegedly defective claims 1, 4-10 and 14.

The specification has been amended without adding any new matter to better indicate support in the specification for claims 1, 4-10 and 14. By way of example, Claim 1 is fully supported by FIGs. 5-11 and corresponding descriptions in the specification, and claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are fully supported by FIGs. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 and the corresponding descriptions, respectively. Further, claim 14 is fully supported by FIG. 20a and corresponding description in the specification. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

**Appln No. 10/501,201**  
**Amdt date March 29, 2007**  
**Reply to Office action of December 29, 2007**

**II. Rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**


Claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner contends in reference to claims 1 and 14 that "recitation of 'allowing a charge and/or discharge current' appeared in several places in the claims 1 and 14 cause a confusion. Since charge and discharge function cannot be allowed/operated/applied at the same time. Either charge or discharge function can take place alternately or at alternate time." Claims 2-13 and 15-29 were rejected due to their virtual dependency on the allegedly defective claims 1 and 14.

Since claims 1 and 14 have been amended herein to alleviate the reasons for the rejection by the Examiner, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1 and 14 as well as 2-13 and 15-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn. Since claims 1-29 were not otherwise rejected, Applicant requests that these claims be allowed.

**III. Concluding Remarks**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant earnestly solicits an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If there are any remaining issues that can be addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is cordially invited to call Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By   
Jun-Young E. Jeon  
Reg. No. 43,693  
626/795-9900

JEJ/jej

SLS PAS730047.1-\*03/29/07 6:55 PM